



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/756,451	01/08/2001	Christopher M. Edwards	60311A	5541

109 7590 10/07/2003

THE DOW CHEMICAL COMPANY
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY SECTION
P. O. BOX 1967
MIDLAND, MI 48641-1967

EXAMINER

FONTAINE, MONICA A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1732

DATE MAILED: 10/07/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/756,451

Applicant(s)

EDWARDS ET AL.

Examiner

Monica A Fontaine

Art Unit

1732

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

THE REPLY FILED 30 September 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: _____.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____

Claim(s) objected to: _____

Claim(s) rejected: 1-11.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
10. ☒ Other: See Continuation Sheet


MICHAEL COLAIANNI
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Continuation of 10. Other: Applicant's arguments have been considered, but are not persuasive. Applicants contend that Jacobson is not compatible with a pultrusion process because he does not teach drawing or pulling long, continuous material through various unit operations. This is not persuasive because Jacobson clearly teaches drawing a long, continuous material to a forming apparatus, which shapes the material to produce a desired shape (Column 2, lines 49-52; Column 12, lines 3-59). Applicants contend that it is clear that drawing force of a pultrusion process would tighten Jacobson's material and destroy any shaping that had taken place, however that allegation is not apparent or inherent. The primary reference used in the rejection in Paper No. 10, Moyer, clearly teaches applicant's claimed continuous shaping process with the exception of explicitly teaching the formation of articles having varied cross-sectional shapes, although Moyer does teach the formation of articles having any cross-sectional shape (Column 4, lines 32-38). Therefore, Jacobson's continuous shaping process which includes the teaching of the formation of articles having varied cross-sectional shapes is believed to be easily combined with Moyer's process, thus teaching applicant's claimed invention.